		Case 4:07-cv-04187-SBA [Document 75	Filed 04/23/2008	Page 1 of 4
ATORNEYS AT LAW MOUNTAIN VIEW	1 2 3	DAVID L. HAYES (CSB No. 122894) (dhayes@fenwick.com) MICHAEL J. SACKSTEDER (CSB No. 191605) (msacksteder@fenwick.com) SAINA S. SHAMILOV (CSB No. 216636) (sshamilov@fenwick.com)			
	4	(sshamilov@fenwick.com) HECTOR J. RIBERA (CSB No. 221511) (hribera@fenwick.com)			
	5	TODD R. GREGORIAN (CSB NO. 236096) (tgregorian@fenwick.com)			
	6	LESLIE A. KRAMER (CSB NO. 253313) (lkramer@fenwick.com)			
	7	FENWICK & WEST LLP Silicon Valley Center, 801 California Street			
	8 9	Mountain View, CA 94041 Telephone: (650) 988-8500 Facsimile: (650) 938-5200			
	10	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
	11	SAP AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT			
	12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
	13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
	14	OAKLAND DIVISION			
	15	SAP AKTIENGESELLSCHAF	T, a	ase No. 4:07-cv-04187	SBA
	16	German corporation, Plaintiff,			S SUPPLEMENTAL
	17	V.		RELIMINARY INFF ONTENTIONS	ANGEMENT
	18	i2 TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a I corporation,	Delaware [P	PATENT L.R. 3-1]	
	19	Defendant.	Ju	idge: Hon. Saundra B	. Armstrong
	20				
	21	Pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-1 Plaintiff SAP Akteingesellschaft ("SAP") makes to Defendant			
	22	i2 Technologies, Inc. ("i2") this Supplemental Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary			
	23	Infringement Contentions. This disclosure addresses the addition of U.S. Patent No. 7,222,369			
	24	(the '369 patent) to the lawsuit, and is filed pursuant to the instructions in the Court's April 8,			
	25	2008 Order. This disclosure is a supplement to SAP's prior disclosures pursuant to Patent L.R. 3			
	26	1, and is not meant to replace or alter the content of such disclosures.			
	27	SAP's disclosures to date are preliminary. SAP has requested documents from i2; i2's			
	28				
		SAP'S SUPP. PRELIMINARY INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS		(CASE NO. 4:07-CV-04187 SBA

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

productions have not yet been completed, either in response to these requests or pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-4. SAP has also not completed its substantive review of the documents that have been produced. SAP anticipates that the review of these documents, further discovery and other events in the litigation may cause it to further revise, supplement, and/or otherwise modify its infringement contentions and it makes this disclosure without prejudice to doing so.

A. Patent L.R. 3–1(a)

SAP alleges that i2 infringes at least claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32 of the '369 patent.

SAP anticipates that events in the litigation, such as substantive review of documents produced by i2 to date, further discovery to be provided by i2 and/or by third parties and the Court's claim construction may impact the patent claims it will allege i2 infringes. SAP reserves the right to add to or otherwise modify its identification of claims it contends are infringed. SAP additionally reserves the right to add to or otherwise modify its identification of the manner in which claims are infringed.

B. **Patent L.R. 3–1(b)**

SAP preliminarily identifies that the Accused Instrumentalities include i2 Six Supply Chain Collaboration Software Suite, and any other i2 solution that uses a role-based portal to a workplace system.

SAP anticipates that events in the litigation, such as substantive review of documents produced by i2 to date, further discovery to be provided by i2 and/or by third parties and the Court's claim construction may impact the patent claims it will allege i2 infringes and the Accused Instrumentalities it will allege infringe those patent claims. SAP reserves the right to add to or otherwise modify its identification of claims it alleges are infringed and identification of Accused Instrumentalities it contends infringe those claims. SAP additionally reserves the right to add to or otherwise modify its identification of the manner in which claims are infringed.

C. Patent L.R. 3–1(c)

Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a chart preliminarily identifying where each element of each asserted claim is found within the Accused Instrumentalities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

SAP's identification of Accused Instrumentalities above and/or in the accompanying chart is Preliminary. SAP's identification of where elements of asserted claims may be found in the Accused Instrumentalities also is preliminary. These identifications are based upon Plaintiff's present knowledge and analysis. SAP continues its investigation and reserves its right to supplement, amend, and/or revise its contentions as events in the litigation occur and SAP conducts further investigation and/or analysis.

D. <u>Patent L.R. 3–1(d)</u>

SAP presently contends each element of each asserted claim is literally present in the Accused Instrumentalities. SAP reserves its right to assert infringement under the Doctrine of Equivalents in light of further discovery, investigation or analysis, the Court's claim construction, events in the litigation, or positions advanced by i2.

E. <u>Patent L.R. 3–1(e)</u>

The claims of the '369 patent are entitled the priority date of December 20, 2001.

F. <u>Patent L.R. 3–1(f)</u>

Certain versions of SAP's Workplace, Enterprise Portal Tool, Product Lifecycle Management practice the claimed invention in the asserted claims of the '369 patent.

SAP's contentions are made on information it has analyzed as of this date. Many important pieces of discovery relevant to SAP's infringement contentions have not yet been made or were made only so recently as to prevent meaningful analysis. SAP anticipates that outstanding discovery and/or further analysis may impact its contentions and expressly reserves the right to alter and supplement them. Further, in the event that new or different versions of the Accused Instrumentalities are made, SAP anticipates that it may supplement its contentions with respect to such versions.

24

///

///

///

- 25 ///
- 26
- 27
- 28 ///

FENWICK & WEST LLP

Nothing in this disclosure is intended to or does limit SAP's ability to present at trial, at hearing on motion, or otherwise in support of or in opposition to a motion, or in other proceeding, evidence, testimony, or argument in support of its contentions as to i2's infringement or for other purposes. In particular, nothing limits the evidence SAP may introduce pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 702, 703, or 705 or otherwise via witness providing expert testimony.

Dated: April 23, 2008 FENWICK & WEST LLP

By: /s/Todd R. Gregorian
Todd R. Gregorian

Attorneys for Plaintiff SAP Aktiengesellschaft